

**Remarks/Arguments:**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed August 29, 2007.

**SUMMARY OF APPLICANT'S AMENDMENT**

The present reply amends Claims 1-2, 4-15, 18, 20, 22, 25, and 27; and cancels Claims 3, 21, and 28 leaving for Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-2, 4-20, and 22-27.

**CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

Claims 1 and 8 were objected to because of the following informalities: the 'one deployment descriptors' appears to have a typographical error in the plural 'descriptors'. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 8 have been amended as shown above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**DOUBLE PATENTING**

Claims 5, 8, 15, and 22 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 6 and 12 of co-pending Application No. 11/088,173 in view of the WebLogic Server 6.1, 'Developing Weblogic Server J2EE Application'. Claims 6 and 12 of co-pending Application No. 11/088,173 have been canceled.

Claim 2 was provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5, 10, 17, 24 co-pending Application No. 10/772,613. Claim 2 has been amended as shown above and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §101**

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Claims 1-2 and 4-14 have been amended to be "computer based system" claims. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-2 and 4-

14 as amended conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

***CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §112***

Claims 3, 14, 20-21 and 27-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement; and under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Claims 14, 20, and 27 have been amended and Claims 3, 21, and 28 have been canceled, as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 14, 20, and 27 conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

***CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §103***

In the Office Action mailed August 29, 2007, Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WebLogic Server 6.1: Developing Weblogic Server J2EE Applications (hereafter the Weblogic reference).

**Claim 1**

For purposes of expediting prosecution, Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. Applicant respectfully submits that the WebLogic reference does not teach or make obvious the embodiment of Claim 1.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature a *graphical user interface (GUI) capable of invoking the parser; wherein the GUI includes a user-selectable resource hierarchy, settings pane, message area, and toolbar*. Applicant respectfully submits that this feature is not shown or made obvious in the prior art.

**Claims 2 and 4-7**

Claims 2 and 4-7 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the additional features of these claims. Applicant

respectfully submits that Claims 2 and 4-7 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 has been amended to more clearly define *the validator is capable of generating an error when it encounters a syntactic or semantic fault in the at least one deployment descriptor, and using the GUI to display a selectable error message to a user; and in response to a user's selection of the selectable error message, the system can navigate the GUI to the source of the error corresponding to the selectable error message.* Applicant respectfully submits that the WebLogic reference does not disclose or make obvious such a validator. The WebLogic reference discloses the option to validate changes made to deployment descriptors. It does not disclose or make obvious the use of a GUI by the validator to display a selectable error message which the user can select to be navigated to the source of the error.

The embodiment of Claim 5 includes a builder component capable of automatically updating the at least one deployment descriptor to reflect one or more changes in at least one source code file. Applicant respectfully submits that the WebLogic reference does not disclose or make obvious automatically updating a deployment descriptor. The WebLogic reference discloses that the user must explicitly click the Persist button to write changes to the disk.

### **Claims 8, 15, and 22**

For purposes of expediting prosecution, Claims 8, 15, and 22 have been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. Applicant respectfully submits that, as described below, the WebLogic reference does not teach or make obvious the embodiment of Claims 8, 15, and 22.

Claims 8, 15, and 22 have been amended to include the features *updating the first representation to create an updated first representation based on the second representation if at least one source file of the first representation is modified; and generating new deployment descriptors from the updated first representation.* Applicant respectfully submits that these features are not shown or made obvious in the prior art.

It was indicated in the Office Action that although the WebLogic reference does not disclose such a builder that such a builder would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because version compatibility is a well known issue in code development. Applicant respectfully submits that the WebLogic reference and the common knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art do not disclose or make obvious the embodiment of Claims 8, 15, and 22. Version checking may be implemented in a variety of ways. However, the embodiment of Claims 8, 15, and 22 includes updating the first representation to create an updated first representation based on the second representation if at least one source file of the first representation is modified; and generating new deployment descriptors from the updated first representation. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art does not disclose or make obvious the embodiment of Claims 8, 15, and 22.

#### **Claims 9-14, 16-20, and 23-27**

Claims 9-14, 16-20, and 23-27 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the additional features of these claims. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 9-14, 16-20, and 23-27 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 12 and corresponding method and computer readable medium claims 18 and 25 have been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein as modules are not deleted from the first representation. It was indicated in the Office Action that adding one element from a second representation to a first representation reads on the latter representation not deleted. In the embodiment of Claims 12, 18, and 25, information from the second representation can be added to the first representation, but modules from the first representation are not deleted.

#### **CONCLUSION**

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is

Application No.: 10/772,626  
Reply to Office Action dated: August 29, 2007  
Reply dated: November 19, 2007

requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 19, 2007

By: / Nathan L. Feld /

Nathan L. Feld  
Reg. No. 59,725

Customer No.: 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14th Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800